

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0029/01 0151619
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 151619Z JAN 10
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3654
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHMFIUU/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSAC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000029

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (BROWN, DENYER AND CRISTOFARO)
NSC FOR LUTES
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [OPCW](#) [CWC](#)
SUBJECT: CWC: WRAP-UP FOR WEEK ENDING JANUARY 15, 2010

REF: A. THE HAGUE 21
[1](#)B. 09 THE HAGUE 755

This is CWC-03-09.

[1](#)1. (U) This includes an action request: see para
[1](#)12.

SUMMARY

[1](#)2. (SBU) As delegations return to The Hague from the long holidays, work at the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) is picking up speed. The Western European and Others Group (WEOG) held its first meeting of the year on January 12. Delreps called on Executive Council (EC) Chairman Jorge Lomonaco (Mexico) (reported separately in Ref A) on January 12 and on WEOG Vice Chairman Pieter de Savornin Lohman (Netherlands) on January 13 to discuss current issues, including the future WEOG Chairperson of the EC and upcoming consultations on the 2012 destruction deadline and "situations unforeseen" by the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). German Ambassador Werner Burkart invited Delreps as well as the French and British Deputy PermReps to a Quad lunch to discuss these and other topics on January 15.

[1](#)3. (SBU) TDY Delreps met with visiting Iraqi technical experts and the Technical Secretariat (TS) to discuss Iraq's initial declaration and destruction planning on January 13-14 (to be reported by septel). TDY Delreps also met with TS staff privately to discuss Libya's progress toward construction of its weapons destruction facility at Rabta (detailed below).

THE NEXT EC CHAIR

[1](#)4. (SBU) During the first WEOG meeting of the new year on January 12, Coordinator Ruth Surkau (Germany) opened discussion on selection of the

next Chairman of the Executive Council. Working his way through the ten EC members from the WEOG, German Ambassador Burkart noted that three WEOG ambassadors (Canada, Denmark and Germany) will leave during the summer and could not take up the position. Three other countries (the U.S., as a possessor state, Turkey, given that the incoming Director-General is Turkish, and Spain, which currently holds the rotating EU presidency) likely would be unable to take on the role due to potential conflicts of interest. Burkart concluded that the chair could come from one of the four remaining countries (France, Italy, Luxembourg and the UK).

15. (SBU) UK Delegate Karen Wolstenholme said that London was interested in the possibility of splitting the chairmanship between countries and wanted to know if there were any precedent to do so and whether WEOG would consider the option. Dutch Ambassador Lohman immediately responded that WEOG, as one of the pillars of the OPCW, has a responsibility to find a year-long solution of one ambassador to fill the role. Spanish Ambassador Prat y Coll agreed, noting that the four possibilities all come from the EU and that it reflect poorly on both the EU and WEOG if one of them couldn't take up the chairmanship; he opined that the burden for the next EC Chair will be much less than for the current Chair (Mexican Ambassador Lomonaco). Surkau proposed that Burkart continue consulting with ambassadors and reach agreement among the ten WEOG EC members before reporting back to the whole WEOG for the group's approval.

16. (SBU) Delreps Beik and Granger met with Dutch Ambassador Lohman on January 13, who provided his insight into the selection of the next EC Chairman. According to Lohman, the EU will sort out internally between the four possible ambassadors. Lohman thinks that UK Ambassador Arkwright is most qualified and would be a strong Chair, but Arkwright categorically has stated that he does not want the position. Lohman considered French Ambassador Blarel the next best choice, but is concerned that he would not be well advised by his new deputy. Luxembourg Ambassador Hoscheit has experience in the UN Security Council, but a tiny staff. Lohman thought that Hoscheit might be persuaded to take the job, and said the Dutch might be able to provide some support for his time as Chairman under Benelux cooperation. Luxembourg traded its term on the Council with Belgium, who will hold the rotating European Union Presidency in the second half of 2010. Lohman also thought it too early to rule out the Turkish Ambassador. While he agreed that a new Turkish Director-General and a Turkish EC Chair might be awkward, he thought it possible.

17. (SBU) In the Quad lunch on January 15, UK Delegate Wolstenholme noted that London had ruled out her Ambassador taking the chairmanship, since the UK had chaired the working group for the Second Review Conference for 18 months, and the second delegate position had been slashed. French Delegate Rabia did not comment on her Ambassador's availability. German Ambassador Burkart noted that he had detected some interest when he met with the Luxembourg Ambassador, but that Hoscheit had declined on the excuse of limited staffing. Burkart plans to continue to pursue a candidate for this critical leadership post.

"SITUATIONS UNFORESEEN"

¶8. (SBU) During the WEOG meeting on January 12, Facilitator Michel Hurley (Ireland) started his update by noting that the TS suddenly has become seized with the issue. Hurley has been working with Legal Advisor Onate on a paper to circulate in advance of his next consultation; he plans to circulate the paper and have a consultation in the second half of January and then meet again in February before the next EC session for a follow-up consultation on his paper. Hurley said he is concerned with protecting the mandate given to him by the EC in October and keeping the consultation from being stretched in various directions. However, he indicated that the draft guidelines could be useful in considering Iraq's destruction of its chemical weapons (CW).

¶9. (SBU) Italian Delegate Giuseppe Cornacchia questioned the title chosen for Hurley's consultations claiming that nothing is unforeseen in the Convention. Cornacchia also raised concern with linking Hurley's consultation with Iraq, questioning the rationale for such a linkage. Delrep and UK Delegate Wolstenholme echoed Cornacchia's sentiments on not including Iraq in Hurley's consultation. German Ambassador Burkart QHurley's consultation. German Ambassador Burkart questioned the motivation for the TS inserting itself into the issue and also echoed Cornacchia's comments on the need for clarifying the title "unforeseen circumstances." Spanish Ambassador Prat y Coll and Dutch Ambassador Lohman both voiced concern at provisions in the South African paper (circulated before Hurley's first consultation in November) to include Iraqi destruction of its declared CW stockpile as an "unforeseen situation." Hurley clarified that he is not including the terms or concepts of control and possession in his paper and that, as facilitator, he will guide discussions appropriately.

¶10. (SBU) While meeting with Delreps on January 13, Dutch Ambassador Lohman opined that, in its draft paper, South Africa had exposed its true intentions of including Iraq in the discussion on "unforeseen circumstances". Lohman also claimed that Hurley is under tremendous pressure from South African Ambassador Peter Goosen. He then went on to express general concern with Goosen's attempts to sideline the TS and foment distrust, as well as Goosen's bullying of other African delegations into supporting South African positions and initiatives.

¶10. (SBU) Facilitator Hurley phoned Delrep on January 15 and said he would be sending an advance copy of his draft paper by the end of the day, along with notes on his thinking (copy sent to ISN/CB). Given the time remaining before the Executive Council, he will circulate the paper early the week of January 18, but welcomes feedback. He expects lots of comments, both public and private, and will likely need to produce a second draft between his consultations (tentatively set for January 28 and February 11). Delrep arranged to meet with Hurley on January 22 to discuss the draft paper (and any initial responses).

¶12. ACTION REQUEST: Del requests feedback on the draft paper and guidance for the January 28 consultation on this issue.

2012 DEADLINE

¶13. (SBU) As reported in Ref A, Delreps met with EC Chairman Lomonaco on January 12 to discuss his

consultation on issues related to the 2012 destruction deadline. Delreps also discussed the issue with Dutch Ambassador Lohman on January 13. Lohman described Lomonaco's planned tact of focusing initially on practical considerations as a clever approach and said that Lomonaco should be supported. While Lohman thought that Iran and others would not like the approach, he thought it was useful to move away from the debate on non-compliance and open up discussion of the future of the OPCW. However, during the Quad lunch on January 15, German Ambassador Burkart instantly expressed doubts whether Lomonaco could successfully focus discussion away from the non-compliance issue, saying that discussion of practical considerations will be seen purely as a diversionary tactic.

TS ON LIBYA

¶14. (SBU) On January 12, TDY Delreps met with Horst Reeps, Director Verification Division, and Yaugen Ryzhykau, Senior Chemical Demilitarization Officer, to discuss Libyan progress on its conversion and destruction sites. The last TS visit to Rabta was during June-July last year, where they found the Rabta destruction site "exceptionally clean" with no apparent construction. The TS is operating under the assumption that the Rabta conversion was complete as of December 31, 2009, in accordance with Libyan obligations, and the next inspection to Qwith Libyan obligations, and the next inspection to certify conversion will be at the end of January or early February. They will drive by the destruction site at that time and see what, if anything, is happening there, but will not be authorized to stop there.

¶15. (SBU) For the Ruwagha storage facility, the TS conducted an inspection in December. The inspection team saw no signs of construction activity on the burner or hydrolysis lagoons necessary for pinacolyl alcohol, isopropanol, thionyl chloride and phosphorus trichloride destruction. The Libyans plan to start operations in late March at Ruwagha, but only "described on fingers" to the TS team how they were going to do it.

¶16. (SBU) The TS said the Rabta Destruction Facility Agreement and the general plan for destruction have not been modified to include the changes in category 2 destruction at Ruwagha. On November 17, 2009, the TS sent a letter to the Libyan government requesting information. The TS has received no response and will send a second letter next week.

¶17. (SBU) Ryzhykau indicated that recently whenever the TS meets with the Libyans, particularly the Head of the National Authority (who is also commander of the chemical corps), they get political lectures about various topics ranging from the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to Libya's not receiving proper support since it gave up its weapons of mass destruction.

¶18. (SBU) DEL COMMENT: When the delegation requested a meeting with the Libyan delegation during the TDY experts' visit the week of January 11, the Libyan PermRep requested a non-paper to forward the request to Tripoli. In the previous meeting (Ref B), we requested additional information from the Libyan government that has not been forthcoming.

119. (U) BEIK SENDS.

LEVIN